heavy-handed administrative rules and bureaucratic procedures. Must be willing to listen with judicial patience to even the pettiest complaints of the lowliest citizens and prepared to speak out and act for the individual in all cases where he is being wronged by government. Must be impervious to pressure and indifferent to rank. Candidates with political obligations or ambitions need not apply. Salary will be suitable.

The list of qualifications cited above offers some guidelines for the position of "ombudsman," an intriguing job category I hope is going to develop with some success on the American scene. In fact, it strikes me as one of the most interesting employment inventions ever, and I have a not-so-sneaking wish that I were old enough, impeccable enough and had the legal experience to apply. For the job is, in itself, a marvelously open admission that government operations on all levels are capable of abusing the citizenry, and that public officials, elected or appointed, are on occasion cruel, venal, careless or stupid. The fact that under the ombudsman concept a private person can take his beef against the system to a man with the responsibility and authority to explore it and even to *do* something about it is positively intoxicating.

Of course, the idea has not really caught on here at all, though there has been a lot of talk about it recently. Especially in New York City, where a civilian-dominated board to review complaints against the police was resoundingly voted out of existence, the motion is being considered as an alternative, and it is spoken of with polite interets even by those who bitterly opposed the review board. Mayor John Lindsay, who fought to keep the board, is studying the possibilities of creating an ombudsman office for the city, and under the sponsorship of the local Civil Liberties Union prominent citizens have been meeting to try to reach agreement on some general recommendations. Yet my hunch is that politicians in New York and elsewhere in the country will be somewhat sluggish about welcoming unbeholden men to power, particularly when one of the prime charges of that power is to illuminate and thereby correct flaws in the working of the establishment. More is the pity.

Ombudsmen have been successfully at work since 1809 in Sweden, which is where the job and the term for it originated. Ombudsman (with the accent on the "om") simply means representative, and although some Americans have suggested more imposing titles like "Public Protector" and "Director of Citizen Redress," I like it best in straight Swedish. Over the years the job has spread to the other Scandinavian countries, to New Zealand and to Great Britain, where the work is done by a parliamentary commission.

There are differences in the amounts of power held by ombudsmen in various places, and in Sweden this man, appointed by the parliament, can actually prosecute officials who he decides are guilty of misuse of their authority. The current ombudsman there is a 63-year-old former judge named Alfred Bexellus, and he and his staff of 10 look into about 1,200 complaints a year. The majority of these are dismissed, but the thorough, prompt investigation of many of the gripes—about police behavior, prison conditions, over-severe judges, by-the-book civil servants—has resulted in the correction of injustices and even in administrative reform.

Perhaps the most unusual case handled by Mr. Bexellus had to do with a lady who insisted, for five years, that a gravedigger had made a mistake in the heavy snow and buried her father in the wrong plot. Her many requests that the grave be dug up to decide the matter were pushed aside by church and other authorities. But when the lady finally appealed to the ombudsman and he sharply criticized these officials, shovels were hastily broken out. Sure enough the lady was right: her father had been misinterred.

Naturally there are certain drawbacks to the job. From the point of view of the ombudsman himself, it could get awfully depressing to listen to all those complaints, a lot of them unfounded, vindictive or even quite mad. Then, too, the conscientious ombudsman would have to be wary of his own great power. "It is very dangerous to lie to the ombudsman," Mr. Bexelius said in a recent reference to the strength of his office, and the danger is that a mortal might abuse it. And there are some critics who argue that the creation of the job, either on local, state or even federal levels, would merely add a superfluous layer to an overloaded hierarchy. Some legislators claim that they already fulfill the ombudsman function for their constituents, that they can look into reported injustices and see that something is done about them. But Professor Walter Gellhorn of the Columbia Law School disagrees. This country's leading ombudsman expert and author of a book called *Ombudsmen and Others*, Gellhorn points out that most complaints given busy legislators are simply passed along to the official or the agency the constituent is complaining about.

There will, of course, have to be much careful thought given to the techniques of establishing ombudsmen in the U.S. The study group in New York is considering such matters as the extent of the man's jurisdiction, the length of his term, the means of his selection. This last is a specially slippery area of discussion because a most vital requisite for the job is that its holder be completely immune to political influence. Thus an ombudsman appointed by, say, a mayor could conceivably be accused later of being timid about checking complaints that might embarrass his benefactor.

Still, I'm sure that these trifling obstacles can be overcome, particularly if we—the potential complainants—maintain the public pressure. Surely the presence of ombudsmen at various levels of government will actually encourage officials in the good performance of their jobs. I'm willing even to agree that an ombudsman doesn't really need punitive power. It will be enough for me that he can listen, investigate, recommend and then, if nothing happens, scream bloody murder in all the newspapers. And it will be so good for the average, private man to have a place he can go to with his grievances. For example, just the other day I parked my car along this street, and all of a sudden this policeman comes up and . . .

FACE TO FACE—A CONFRONTATION BETWEEN SENATOR EDWARD KENNEDY AND SENATOR JOHN TOWER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] have participated in a television discussion of the major issues facing our Nation today, particularly the war in Vietnam. This program was telecast in Washington, D.C., last night over channel 5, WTTG. The debate occurred last weekend and is the first part of a Metromedia television series entitled "Face to Face." It will subsequently be shown in the major cities across the Nation. I think that it will add immeasurably to a public understanding of the issues facing our country, particularly the problems arising from the conflict in Vietnam.

While I find myself more closely alined with the views of the distinguished Senator from Texas on the Vietnam issue, I believe that the entire debate between our two colleagues is of such interest and importance that the transcript should be made available to all Senators and to the public. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACE TO FACE

(A confrontation between Senator EDWARD KENNEDY and Senator JOHN TOWER on WTTG, a division of Metromedia, Inc.)

Mr. EVANS. The program is called "Face to Face." It originates at Kay Center, at historic American University in Washington, D.C. Both guests have much in common; they have also much in which they do not agree. The three things they have rather uniquely in common are: both hold seats in the Senate formerly held by Presidents of the United States; each was, when elected, the youngest member of the most exclusive club in the world, the Senate. And incidentally, neither had previously held public office prior to being elected to the Senate.

Yielding now to seniority, may I introduce the distinguished Senator from Texas, Senator JOHN TOWER.

(General applause.)

Senator TOWER is a forty-one year old former economics professor; is most at home on a college campus. He labels himself as a progressive-conservative. Senator TOWER serves on two major Senate Committees; they are Armed Services and Banking and Currency, as well as a number of Senate Sub-Committees. He was reelected on the Republican ticket in 1966 by a fifty-seven percent margin from a normally Democratic state. Senator TOWER has just returned from his third tour of the Far East, including Vietnam.

Now may I introduce a man who hardly needs introduction, Senator EDWARD "TED" KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

(General applause.)

Senator Kennedy, not much older than some of the students on this campus, is the ripe old age of thirty-five. He came to the Senate in November of 1962, after being elected to fill the unexpired term of his big brother, the late President of the United States. In 1964, he was reelected to a full term, winning by the largest plurality ever given a state-wide candidate in the state of Massachusetts. The Senator serves on Labor and Public Welfare and the Judiciary Committee, as well as several Sub-Committees. Mr. Kennedy has been particularly interested in legislation involving the draft, and immigration.

Now our two articulate advocates of the conservative and liberal political philosophies promise an hour of divergent views. I personally am looking forward to that confrontation; I hope you are. It will take place in just a moment.

Mr. EVANS. Now, briefly, gentlemen, the ground rules are very simple. I recognize that our worst enemy will be time, and that you're not exactly limited in the Senate on what you can say about certain subjects, but we have to be here. Each Senator will have a maximum of two minutes to reply to each question. After each has done so, we hope you will openly and freely discuss the problems face to face. As I mentioned earlier, half-way in the program, we will ask students here tonight to join in the questions.

I don't think there's anything more confusing to the American people right now than Vietnam and the war going on there. We'd like very much—and again, yielding

cf. NSA BOOK for full text